



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,094	06/29/2001	Richard Dale Hoffman	AUS920010550US1	6699

7590 08/25/2004

Cynthia S. Byrd
International Business Machines
Intellectual Property Law
11400 Burnet Rd.
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,094

Applicant(s)

HOFFMAN, RICHARD DALE

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/12/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed 06/29/2001.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schneider US Patent No. 6,338,082 B1 issued 01/08/2002 filed 03/15/2000 (hereinafter '082), in view of Neilsen US Patent No. 5,907,680 issued 05/25/1999 filed 06/24/1996 (hereinafter '680).**

Claim 1 is representing claims 2-8;

In regard to dependent claim 1, "upon receipt of the character string at the client", as taught by '082 at col. 1, line 45 through col. 2, line 35 (i.e..... Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) connection that employs a standard Internet setup. A server computer may provide the data and a client computer may display or

process it... A network resource identifier such as a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) is a compact string of characters for identifying an abstract or physical resource...).

'082 does not explicitly teach, "*checking the character string for typing errors; and upon detection of a typing error, correcting the typing error, absent input from a user to produce a corrected character string*", however, as taught by '680 at col. 2, lines 15-50 (i.e..... provide a user who manually enters a URL with a sophisticated method for spell checking the URL to increase the probability of finding the desired WWW in a timely fashion... The three components (client-side, server-side and collaborative) represent three unique but complementary methods of providing spelling check services to the user. Each component resides on a different part of the WWW and addresses the spelling check problem differently. The multi-platform and dynamic nature of the WWW suggests that a user cannot be assured that all three components are always available...).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a feature, wherein the error detection/correction for typing error for character string feature is embedded in a system with IP client. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to perform a simplistic spell check on manual enter URL (Internet Protocol) for error correction, fast access, and update the knowledge base that will assist all future users, as taught by '680 at col. 2, lines 1-55 (i.e. ...spell check on manual enter URL...).

In regard to dependent claim 2, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale,

"wherein the typing errors are selected from punctuation errors and...", as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 17-33 (i.e..... Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address...).

In regard to dependent claim 3, *"replacing the punctuation error with a correct punctuation mark"*, as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 35-45 (i.e..... it is then further determined in step 234 whether input 210 includes a valid URI. If there is no valid URI, then a valid URI is generated in step 238 from input 210. For instance, if a scheme is missing, the web browser may add the prefix "http://" to the text or another scheme prefix...).

In regard to dependent claim 4, *"replacing the spelling error with a correct spelling"*, as taught by '082 at col. 6, lines 60-67 (i.e..... spell checked (310) and a list of potential URLs is generated (312). If the list is not empty (314) then the list of URLs is displayed to the user in a hypertext format (316) where the user can either select one of the URLs or cancel (318)...).

In regard to dependent claim 5, *"the typing errors are predefined"*, as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 17-28 (i.e..... Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that

input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address present... there is no domain name or IP address present and the input 210 is processed as a search request in step 218. Results, if any, are then notified, accessed, and/or displayed in step 222. When the presence of the "." delimiter is determined in step 214, the input may include either an IP address or a domain name. When a domain name is parsed, the validity of the domain name is determined in step 226. Validity of URI syntax is explained in T. Berners-Lee, "Informational RFC (Request for Comment) 1630...).

In regard to dependent claim 6, "wherein the spelling errors are predefined", as taught by '680 at col. 7, lines 8-12 (i.e. If the selected URL is insufficient to retrieve a document (324) then, using the prior art, the "Document Not Found" error message is displayed (328), the invalid URL is removed from the list (330) and processing resumes at (314), continuing until a document is retrieved).

In regard to dependent claim 7, "wherein the punctuation errors are predefined", '082 at col. 11, lines 17-28 (i.e. Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address present... there is no domain name or IP address present and the input 210 is processed as a search request in step 218. Results, if any, are then notified, accessed, and/or displayed in step 222. When the presence of the "." delimiter is determined in step 214, the input may include either an IP address or a domain name. When a domain name is parsed, the validity of the domain name is determined in

step 226. Validity of URI syntax is explained in T. Berners-Lee, "Informational RFC (Request for Comment) 1630...).

In regard to dependent claim 8, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale,

"connecting the IP client to an IP server", as taught by '082 at col. 1, line 45 through col. 2, line 35 (i.e..... Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) connection that employs a standard Internet setup. A server computer may provide the data and a client computer may display or process it...).

In regard to independent claim 9, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 10, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 12, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 5, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 13, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 14, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 16, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 5, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Belfiore et al U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459 issued 12/28/1999 filed 01/10/1997

Berstis et al U.S. Patent No. 6,092,100 issued 07/18/2000 filed 11/2/1997

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781, **"After mid-Oct, 2004, the examiner can be reach at (571) 272- 4103"**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
August 23, 2004